India

FOR THE

No. 194. New Series.
No. 288. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1901. [Registered as a Newspaper. {Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 133
Ominous 136
Notes from Bombay: The Land Revenue Bill 137
Chronicle of the Week 138
Letter to the Editor :—
"Land Assessments and Middlemen" 139
Glasgow International Assembly : Lectures on India—
III. Professor Murison on Education, the Press, Self-Government, and General Progress... 139
The Famine in India 143
British Indians in South Africa ... 143
Advertisements 144

NOTES AND NEWS.

WE received a few days ago, and we print elsewhere, a memorial which the East India Association submitted to Mr. Chamberlain at the end of July with reference to the position of British Indians in South Africa. It is a brief and mild document—perhaps some might think it excessively mild—but we must suppose that the Association believed this to be the most judicious mode of approaching the matter. It is, however, a remarkable reflection upon the current "Imperialist" tendencies, and indeed upon the supposed consistency of statesmen, that men should have to adopt a tone of hesitating and whispering humbleness in inviting a Minister to revoke in territories that have passed under his control laws and regulations which, when those territories were in other hands, he deprecated and condemned. The East India Association point out, as we have so often pointed out in these columns, that so far as the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony are concerned our Government has a "tabula rasa" whereon to inscribe such equity as it may think fit, and the importance of the occasion is increased by the fact that the Colonial Office, where it acts on its own responsibility, has an opportunity of setting a much-needed example to our self-governing colonies. The memorial is no doubt right when it says that "no such opportunity will occur again."

The remainder of the Memorial is open to more serious criticism. It proceeds to suggest action which might be taken "if it be still found impossible to secure more liberal treatment of our Indian fellow-subjects." That is a contingency which ought not to be contemplated. Nor is there any question of "more liberal" treatment. What the Indians ask for is merely just and decent treatment of the kind which Mr. Chamberlain was ready enough to urge upon Mr. Kruger. If, however, Mr. Chamberlain should fail in his manifest duty, the course recommended, somewhat prematurely, by the East India Association would be proper enough.

> It would be only reasonable and right (they say) for the Government of India to advise them (i.e., Indians) to avoid South Africa altogether, and at the same time to prohibit the emigration of indentured coolies to any part of that country; for if the Indian Government is not in a position to secure their just rights for British Indian traders abroad, it can do no less than warn them of the fact, and adopt the only measure which seems likely to compel the adoption of a more reasonable policy.

Which, we take it, is a "reductio ad absurdum" of Imperialism. We should like to know what action, if any, the Indian Government and the India Office have taken in the matter. We know of none. Yet this is a question upon which Lord George Hamilton ought to have been bringing constant pressure to bear on his colleagues in the Cabinet. He should have had, too, a vigorous ally in Lord Lansdowne who, it will be remembered, in the early days of the war, assured a public meeting that none of the acts of Mr. Kruger's Government had excited his indignation more than the treatment it meted out to British Indians.

In this connexion we may well recall an excellent passage from the speech of Sir M. M. Bhownaggree in the recent "debate on the Indian Budget." Referring to the treatment of British Indian subjects in the South African and other colonies he said :—

> When a great invasion was made on the rights and privileges of the people of India who had occasion to reside in those countries he wanted to know by what means that invasion was going to be met in future. There had been a thrill of delight throughout India at the announcement that Mr. Chamberlain had disallowed the Queensland Asiatic Act because it included British Indian subjects solely on account of race and colour. He hoped the right hon. gentleman would forbid such legislation in other colonies. If no steps were taken to arrest it, if further tolerance was granted to that despicable and vile system which British fellow-subjects gave to other British fellow-subjects within the limits of their colonies, then he said the time would come, and that before long, when the House of Commons would have to pronounce a verdict whether the promises and pledges given repeatedly by the British nation to the people of India were to have force and effect or not. (Hear, hear.) If Imperial statesmen were to throw up their hands and say that because they had given self-government to colonies here and there those colonies could not be touched when they trampled in the dust the great traditions of British rule, then the right to govern India from here would be to a large extent modified in the eyes of the Natives of India and other foreign countries. (Hear, hear.)

That is perfectly true. And with what face can British statesmen require self-governing colonies to set their house in order if, where the matter is in their own hands, they perpetuate the very system they have condemned?

So far as the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony are concerned, the latest official pronouncement is contained, we believe, in the answer which Mr. Chamberlain gave in the House of Commons on May 24 to a question from Sir M. M. Bhownaggree. The Colonial Secretary then said :—

> The legislation of the late Government of the South African Republic remains in force until modified. I have not yet learnt the views of the new Administration as to the changes to be made in regard to the regulations in question, and I propose to discuss the matter with Sir Alfred Milner now that he has arrived.

Why should Mr. Chamberlain wait for "the views of the new Administration"? He was already bound in honour to give effect to the representations he had made to Mr. Kruger. And what did Lord Milner say? It would be well if the East India Association, or some other body, were to obtain information upon this point. Meantime the statement that "the legislation of the late Government of the South African Republic remains in force until modified" covers a mischievous fallacy. Under the late Government the legislation in question was practically a dead letter, at least for the respectable Indian traders. But it has since been enforced with British military precision. It would be bad and unreasonable enough to have maintained the "status quo." But the actual system is an aggravation of the "status quo."

The "Times" of Tuesday last contained a characteristic telegram from its Simla correspondent making a rather skilful attack upon Mr. Cotton, the well-known Commissioner of Assam. "Within the last few weeks," said the correspondent, "strained relations have developed" between Mr. Cotton and the tea planters. The occasion of the quarrel was "the publication of the annual emigration [apparently a misprint for immigration] report." And the ingenuous reporter, alleging that it was impossible to enter into details by telegraph, proceeded to summarise, if not to adopt, the complaints urged against Mr. Cotton as follows :—

> His unreasonable bias against all employers on account of the failings of a few, the omission of important and relevant facts in the chapter of the report describing the relations between employers and employed, and his methods generally of prosecuting a wage campaign are condemned.

The telegram added—not without a suggestion of menace—that "the report is now under the consideration of the

Government of India, whose action in the matter is awaited with considerable interest."

Our Indian readers, of course, do not need to be told on which side the merits of the dispute lie. But for the information of readers in this country it may be pertinent to recall one or two facts. In our issue of April 5 last (p. 162) we printed from our Bombay Correspondent an account of Mr. Cotton's chivalrous campaign on behalf of the coolies—"slaves" one might almost call them—of the tea-gardens in the debates on the Assam Labour Bill. Mr. Cotton on that occasion was mysteriously deserted by some of his colleagues in the Viceroy's Legislative Council and although, by dint of the greatest persistence, he was able to secure a slight enhancement of wages for the miserable coolies, a compromise was adopted by which the enhancement was postponed for two years. As our Correspondent put it:—

It was urged that the depressed industry should have time to recover itself. Whether this be the correct plea, or whether it was thought that at the end of two years there would not be a Commissioner of the stamp of Mr. Cotton to enforce the legislation, I need not stop to enquire.

And our Correspondent added:—

No official in this controversy has emerged with grace and credit from it save Mr. Cotton. One who heard his powerful and eloquent, nay, earnest and convincing, speech in the Council writes to me a long account of that official. He has nothing but unbounded praise for his sterling independence and public spirit. But civilians of the type of Mr. Cotton are rare. They never are "personae gratae." No wonder that Mr. Cotton is still only a Chief Commissioner when he should have long ago been Lieut.-Governor of Bengal.

In May, again, we gave (p. 206) some account of Mr. Cotton's return to Assam after his battle in the Legislative Council. The people accorded him the warmest of welcomes, and presented him with an address in which they described him as the champion of the "poor voiceless coolies" and declared that his "single-handed and heroic fight for justice and humanity" would never be forgotten by Indians. The "Mahratta," commenting in distant Poona upon this demonstration, observed that Mr. Cotton had been able to do what few had done—to command the respect of the Government "by sheer ability and trustworthiness," and at the same time to win the gratitude and affection of the people. We may add, on excellent authority, that Mr. Cotton is, with a few others, somewhat conspicuous among Englishmen in India for the uniform civility and consideration with which he treats Indians.

It is, then, upon this disinterested official that an attack is being made by the planters, or some of them, with the assistance, it would seem, of the Simla correspondent of the "Times," and, therefore, with the approval of those whose opinions it is his business to echo. The occasion of the attack is the report on Labour Immigration into Assam during the year 1900, and especially the chapter headed "Relations between Employers and Employed." Now it happens by a fortunate coincidence that some of the overland summaries brought by the last mail contain considerable extracts from this chapter, and the facts which they recite are deplorable enough. We read that "ten cases of serious rioting were reported by the District Officers," and that "blows given by managers, or more commonly by assistant managers, to coolies, were the immediate cause of most of the rioting cases which occurred during the year." A feature of the local reports is the cheerful opinions expressed by deputy commissioners which have to be weighed in the light of the facts. Thus the deputy commissioner of Darrung writes many optimistic generalities about his district, to which Mr. Cotton has to add this brief statement of fact:—

Nevertheless two of the worst cases of oppression reported last year were in this district. In one case a planter was fined 500 rupees for ordering a woman to be flogged. In another the coolies were abominably ill-treated by the planter manager, and the Chief Commissioner ordered his prosecution.

Another deputy commissioner remarks upon the frequency of complaints by coolies of detention after the expiry of their agreements. Then we find a summary of twelve of the "more important cases of collision between employers and labourers." We propose to take another opportunity of reproducing this part of the report for the information of our English readers and of Parliament and the Press. Here we may cite a typical case. An assistant-manager, having struck a dafadar with a cane, was threatened by some coolies. No assault, however, was actually committed. Yet six coolies were prosecuted and sentenced to three months' rigorous imprisonment. Reporting this case the local official has the hardihood to observe:—

As between man and man I should consider the sentence excessive, but as between a manager of a garden and his coolies I am not prepared to say that it is excessive.

The abstract of cases is followed by these remarks:—

Mr. Cotton has taken the pains to refer at some length to these cases principally because they illustrate the fact to which he drew attention in a previous annual report, that there is an undoubted tendency among magistrates in Assam to inflict severe sentences in cases in which coolies are charged with committing offences against their employers and to impose light and sometimes inadequate punishments upon employers when they are convicted of offences against labourers.

"The position of magistrates in Assam," Mr. Cotton adds, "is certainly a very difficult one, and it is impossible for them to be altogether uninfluenced by their environment and their natural feelings towards their fellow-countrymen who are engaged in the development of an important industry, but this renders it all the more necessary for them to be on their guard against any display, or apparent display, of partiality." Do the planters, one wonders, object to that temperate warning?

"It is impossible," the report continues, "to read the accounts of the cases of which an abstract has been given above without feeling that justice has not been always well and duly administered between man and man." Coming to the question of wages, the report says the most remarkable feature of the figures for 1900 is that "they show a lower rate of wages than the average of any year since 1895. The amount is considerably below the statutory so-called minimum wage." More, "converted to a daily rate, the average wage paid to men has been a little over two annas and nine pies, and the average wage paid to women has been a little over two annas a day." Twopence or threepence a day for wages, and the planters have the effrontery to complain that Mr. Cotton is unreasonable in desiring an increase! One looks in vain for any evidence of bias here. What alarms the planters is obviously the publication, not of opinions, but of facts for which they are themselves responsible. Mr. Cotton, we are glad to see, concludes with a strong recommendation in favour of the abolition of the penal contract—that is, slavery—system. The sooner it is abolished the better. The system has proved abominable in practice, and in theory it is a disgrace to the Government which tolerates it.

We deeply regret the death of Sir Sheshadri Iyar, ex-Diwan of Mysore. Sir Sheshadri leaves behind him the reputation of one of the foremost Native statesmen of his century. With the exception of a couple of years, the administration of Mysore has been directed by the deceased statesman since the rendition of 1881, and the results have greatly justified the rendition. A correspondent of the "Times" writes (September 17):—

Within the two decades the State revenues have been doubled; several hundred miles of railways and other important public works have been constructed; local self-government has been evolved, the most noteworthy development of it being the annual meeting of a representative assembly for the discussion of State finances and domestic legislation; and a pitch of efficiency has been reached in every department of the public service rare in Native States.

Sir Sheshadri gave earnest attention to irrigation, and to industrial enterprise: the gold-mining industry, which he carefully fostered, and which gives employment now to some 21,000 persons, has been entirely built up in his time. He was an eminently progressive and clear-headed Minister. Strange that such a man should have no scope for his qualities under the British Indian Government!

On Sunday next, September 22, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will address an open-air meeting at Peckham Rye on India. The meeting begins at 2.30 in the afternoon.

Lord Salisbury once upon a time recommended the use of large maps to people nervous about Russian movements in Central Asia, and he has expressed the opinion that there is room enough in Asia for Russia and England both. Such calm and sensible views ought to have some influence now when Russia is seeking an outlet on the Persian Gulf. As Sir Rowland Blennerhassett indicated in the "Times" (August 31), it is difficult to see why we should oppose the advance of Russia to Bandar Abbas when we acquiesce in the extension of the Baghdad Railway, which is almost entirely under German control, to El Kuweit, one of the finest harbours in the world. Of course, the difficulty is India. "Let England," said the "Novoe Vremya" a short time back, "only understand that we do not desire India, but must get down to the Persian Gulf, and the matter is settled." It is certain enough that Russia does not want India on her hands. It is obvious enough that Russia must be allowed fuller access to the sea, and that an expansion of Russian trade could not take place without very great benefits to ourselves. The policy of cramping the natural development of other countries is stupid enough, but it is rather amazing to find England bound to such an antiquated and illiberal course. The blind persistence of our Government in playing into the hands of Germany in spite of the open teaching of facts is paralleled only by their futile resolution to thwart Russia at all costs, reason or none.

It is not very reasonable, then, to grumble when Russia puts a spoke in the British wheel. Russia, by means of a loan last year, has got a certain hold on the Persian Customs, and, as might be expected, works the machinery in such wise as to persuade the trade of Persia to flow in channels marked out and controlled by Russia. Hence comes it that the Indian trade along the Quetta-Nushki route through Persia, a route preferred by all the merchants to the Bandar Abbas route, is beginning to experience a choice variety of obstacles and troubles; and that the idea of Russian supremacy in Persia, to the extinction of British influence, has taken possession of the minds of Indian traders. This is all, of course, perfectly natural. The "Times" traces the mischief to the fact that the British Government otiosely submitted to the pushfulness of Russia, which forbade Persia to contract the loan here, and eventually took it up herself, although, at the moment of Russia's interference, the loan negotiations between Persia and a group of British capitalists were all but complete. As we have made our bed, so must we lie. "Is it or is it not compatible with our interests, commercial and political," asks our contemporary, "to allow a foreign Power with a commercial policy like that of Russia to establish itself on the Persian Gulf?" Hear the answer: "We can offer no decided opinion on this very large and momentous question." Well, but events are moving towards a solution. As the "Times" itself says (September 12): "if we do not solve it, it will solve itself, and solve itself in the manner most injurious to our interests." But it is difficult to look for prompt and far-seeing decision on the part of the Government.

Another correspondent of the "Times," veiling his identity under the signature "W," agrees with Sir Rowland Blennerhassett that we ought to accede to Russia's desire for our co-operation in obtaining for herself an outlet on the Persian Gulf. "It is plain," he says, "that, if Persia ceased to be a field of contention between England and Russia, not only would she herself benefit, but the civilising influences of trade and co-operation would remove the probability of war between those two powers, who might go as far later as to neutralise Persia, and still further jointly to develop her resources." Commenting on "W's" letter, the "Times" (September 12) moves a little. The subject, which is one "of great gravity and delicacy," "cannot remain unsolved." Our contemporary justly blames "the optimism with which the Foreign Office has cloaked its reluctance to face embarrassing problems in the past," and "the procrastination and indecision which that reluctance has induced." But now, it declares, "we cannot afford to have a problem intimately connected with our position in India approached in a spirit of easy negligence." The question must not drift. "We cannot tolerate a Port Arthur incident in the Persian Gulf." This is a stronger tone, no doubt. It is something to poke up the Government. Yet the "Times" goes on to shift the burden a little, by telling us that "the views of the Government of India must be of great weight." Then, "unless and until the various problems connected with the Persian Gulf become the subject of a regular agreement, which the Government of India can declare to be satisfactory, our immediate purpose should be clear." And what is that? Why, "to preserve intact the status quo in a part of the world where any disturbance must affect our vital interests so nearly." Really, the Government will derive no great assistance from the "Times" in finding "a clear, definite, and consistent policy."

"An Anglo-Indian" writes:—"From a recent report by Colonel Kemball, the Indian Government's Resident at Bushire, cited and commented on by the 'Times of India,' it would appear that the quantity of arms and ammunition imported into Oman, to be smuggled into Persia, mainly through its Eastern ports at, or near, Bunder Abbas, 'is as great as it was in the days prior to the seizure of the "Beluchistan" in 1898.' The name of that vessel will serve to recall the tenacity with which its owners, or the firms that chartered the ship to export rifles and ammunition by way of Muscat to the Persian Gulf or the Mekran coast, carried litigation up to our highest Court on behalf of their death-dealing trade. The Resident at Bushire does not admit that the restraints introduced since the seizure of that filibustering merchant-ship have altogether failed. For, as he mentions, the Belgian Customs Administration (how Belgium comes in is not quite obvious) has confiscated 1,000 rifles and large lots of cartridges. Nevertheless, this highly illegitimate commerce continues to flourish in spite of the carefully devised plans of the British Indian Authorities. And it is through the outlying ports of Oman that it is carried on 'by steamers running from the Thames' transhipping their consignments through Arab coasting craft. Thence contraband arms get into Southern Persia, then 'by devious routes reaching the tribes on the Indian borderland.'

"It is in regard to this remote destination of the illicit traffic that the vigilant zeal of the Indian Press is chiefly directed. If the import of these arms could be supposed to fortify the Persians themselves against the political encroachments of the ever-designing Muscovites—so constantly on the nerves of some of your Bombay contemporaries during the last three years—then, perhaps, this irregular traffic might not be so entirely condemned. But, of course, it is quite 'another pair of shoes' if these smuggled rifles are used by the fierce Afghan tribes to resist, not only political encroachments but actual military invasion from another Power on the east of their mountain territory. However, everybody will agree that the 'influence of the Government of India (should) be again exerted [if it has slackened] towards securing the suppression of a trade so full of elements of danger.' A still wider application may well be given to your contemporary's special illustration thus stated:—Here is a paradox of Empire: Government maintains warships in the Gulf to preserve peace; while Birmingham manufacturers and London exporters ship out whole cargoes of rifles and cartridges which can only destroy peace. And is not similar demoralising and destructive 'commerce' being carried on in other directions at this moment from Hamburg, Marseilles, and Trieste?"

Remittances on India for 35 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications for bills amounting to Rs.10,68,90,000 were received at 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds, and 1s. 4d. The following amounts in bills were allotted, viz.:—Rs.15,25,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 3.969d., Rs.15,28,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3.970d., and Rs.4,47,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3.973d. Tenders at 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds will receive about 3 per cent. Last week remittances for Rs.35,10,000 were sold for £233,554, making the total sold from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs.8,60,33,653, producing £5,710,251. Next week the amount to be offered will be increased to 40 lakhs.

OMINOUS.

NOW that the Bombay Land Revenue Bill has passed, there is nothing for it but to wait and see what is to be the practical upshot. Never, we suppose, has there been witnessed such a hopeless confusion of ideas as has been exhibited on this unlucky Bill. Mr. Monteath expressly refused to call the adverse comments upon it "criticism": of course, he "would have welcomed real criticism and endeavoured to profit by it": but "nine-tenths, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say ninety-nine-hundredths, of what has been said and written" did not, in his (official) opinion, touch any of the questions at issue. We have already remarked on the unhappy inability of the Bombay Government to express their legislative intentions in a form that could not be misunderstood. On the other hand, the political friends of the rayats declare that the Government is not a whit less mistaken in the grounds and issues of the Bill. "We cannot help keenly deploring," said Mr. Mehta, speaking on his amendment on the second reading, "that an idea should prevail in the highest quarters that the agitation against the measure is owing only to the money-lending classes; that it is not bona fide; that the agricultural classes have little or nothing to do with it, and that what little alarm and consternation does prevail have been fanned into a flame by sedulous and interested misrepresentation." Mr. Mehta compared the mistake of the Government as to the character of the expressions of opinion upon this Bill to the disastrous blundering, on imperfect information, as to the feelings and actions of the people in connexion with the earlier plague measures. "We propose," said Lord Northcote, "to offer these people"—that is, the less intelligent and more unfortunate of the rayats—"the chance of a fresh start in life at the expense of the general taxpayer." Mr. Gokhale, on the other hand, demonstrated at great length and with marked earnestness that "this Bill will prove disastrous to the best interests of agriculturists." Mr. Muir Mackenzie actually laboured to show that the Native members of Council could not possess any knowledge of the rayat comparable with the experience of Government officers—officers whom Lord Curzon has been endeavouring to root out of their desks. Mr. Monteath did not advance his argument or clear up the differences of the conflicting views by his caricature of Mr. Mehta's position. So it all came round to the opening opinion of Lord Northcote: "the Government think experience of the operation of the Bill when passed into law will be the most effective reply to such misconceptions" as its opponents are alleged to cherish.

Here, then, is legislation by weight of superior numbers. The issue is decided by the biggest battalions. It is a rule of despotism under the plausible form of representative Government. Why, in the first place, should there be such a thick pall of darkness hanging over the facts and arguments pertinent to this question? For one thing, the Government adopted the utterly vicious method of drafting their Bill by references. We have already pointed out how difficult it is for the most painstaking observer to find out the precise meaning of the Bill, and how hopelessly impossible it is for the rayat to form any opinion whatever except on the explanations submitted to him by the Government, and by non-official advisers. Such a form of procedure, if not intended as mere contempt for popular opinion—and we confess we think it is merely a gross example of official slovenliness, only too well based on precedent—was certain to cause the utmost confusion and difficulty. Again, we repeat, the Bill was hurried forward with such haste that, however leisurely the process may have appeared to the Government, the Bill could not possibly in the time reach the minds of the rayats with due fulness and accuracy of comprehension. It was published on May 18; it was read for the first time on May 30; it was taken up by the Select Committee on May 31; it was overhauled finally by the Select Committee on June 24. "The deliberations of the Select Committee," as Mr. Gokhale pointed out, "were thus closed before the public had any opportunity to submit a single suggestion or a single criticism to that Committee." Petitions, as we have seen, some of them of the weightiest character, have poured in on the Government, and answers of a kind have been returned to a few of these by Government in their Executive capacity. But not one of them came under consideration of the Select Committee, which alone can act on behalf of the Council; and therefore, so far as the Council is concerned, "the memorials against the Bill have been so much waste paper." On the other hand, so far as we have been able to discover, not a single memorial was presented in favour of the Bill. Lord Northcote, it is true, combated the allegation of undue haste by stating that "as a matter of fact the Central and Bombay Government have been discussing the questions of restriction on land legislation for the last six years, though plague and famine exigencies have caused the correspondence to be somewhat intermittent." But obviously that does not meet the charge: the rayats cannot be fixed with knowledge of all this assiduity of correspondence between the Governments. On the contrary, this only shows how reasonably the Bombay Government might have accepted Mr. Mehta's amendment in favour of postponement for six months, within which time the opinion of everybody entitled to an opinion might have been calmly and intelligently expressed and considered by the Select Committee. If the Government be so completely in the right as they think, the strength of their position would have been demonstrated to the confusion of their opponents, and to the satisfaction of everybody else. As it is, public opinion is flouted, and public feeling is exacerbated, and a plunge is made into the unknown on the strength of official opinion alone, vehemently contradicted by the spokesman of the rayat, and all at the expense of that much-governed and hapless person.

After all, the most significant outcome of the discussion was the fact that five of the Indian members of Council deliberately retired from the Council Hall on the vote for the second reading of the Bill. Mr. Mehta had respectfully foreshadowed this result in his speech on his amendment, and apparently official efforts had been made to dissuade him and his friends from taking such a marked step of disapproval. Mr. Gokhale made on his own behalf a special additional disclaimer of disrespect to his Excellency the Governor. "It is only," he said, "an overwhelming sense of responsibility which urges me to take this step." Unquestionably he spoke the sentiments of his four companions—Mr. Mehta, Mr. Parekh, Sir Bhalchandra Krishna, and Mr. Khare. To us, at least, the step appears to be fraught with consequences of a very much more far-reaching character than have yet dawned on the consciousness of some of the official following. The "Times of India," however, is plainly uneasy. Its article (August 27)—to say nothing of a foolish skit from the point of view of "Twenty-five Years After"—bubbles over with the artificial fun that fails to cover unusual pain and presentiment. Our contemporary knows as well as we do the character of these five Native gentlemen. It knows perfectly well that not one of them was "bent upon exploiting the sweet uses of advertisement," and their withdrawal was anything but a "shallow artifice." The Revenue Bill, it is true, remains where it did; and it may be that "everybody is laughing"—that is, everybody that our contemporary regards as anybody; but the class in question is rather narrow, and those laugh best that laugh longest. Less in India than in most places is the immediate effect the final disposition. We shall see.

The "Times of India," however, does well to make some little show of attack on the main point. "It is necessary," it says, "to speak plainly concerning the inevitable moral of these peculiarly absurd antics." Without discussing questions of taste in expression, we will look dispassionately at "the inevitable moral." It is this:—

> Their assistance is not essential to the conduct of public business; and when men are unwilling to accept the responsibilities devolving upon them, their connexion with the Council becomes superfluous. The obvious consequence in such an event would be that it would become necessary to nominate other members who have a clearer grasp of their duties to the State and the public.

Our contemporary is too intelligent not to know that such a threat is a mere "brutum fulmen" to the five members. Nor do we for a moment suppose that it can be anything else to the mind of any other Native that knows his right hand from his left. We must tell the "Times of India" that the assistance of Indian representatives is beyond question "essential to the conduct of public business," and that there are other people who ought to have "a clearer grasp of their duties to the State and the public" than to treat these members in such fashion as to drive them momen-

tarily from the discharge of "the responsibilities devolving upon them." Nay, we seriously doubt whether their retirement was not in the strictest sense a discharge of their responsibilities. There are reciprocal duties here; and the responsibilities are not by any means absolute. It is for the Government to act in such a way as not to nullify the whole end and purpose of the presence of Native representatives on the Legislative Council. Far be it from us to argue that Native members must always be allowed to have their own way: nobody is absurd enough to claim that much. But the object of their presence is to enable the Government to have full possession of Native opinion, and the implication is that Government shall not merely possess such opinion, but shall accord to it reasonably adequate consideration. It is impossible to say that on the present occasion Government has bestowed on the Native representations the consideration to which their intrinsic weight entitles them. The Native members, while ready to discharge their responsibilities, are under no sort of obligation to endure the mere flouts of the Government. It is obviously more than time that the Native representation in the Legislative Councils should be extended both in point of numbers and in point of powers. If the Government and its henchmen of the Press imagine that the policy of the country can be shaped and carried out much longer, not merely without the full assistance, but in absolute defiance of the mature opinion, of Native members, they are labouring under a monumental misconception.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE BOMBAY LAND REVENUE BILL.

THE FARCE OF THE "EXPANDED" COUNCILS.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, August 30.

The telegraph has long since informed the British public of the passing of the unpopular Land Revenue Bill by the sheer weight of official votes. Though the facts and arguments lay with the non-official members, nine of whom, the most representative of all the varied communities of the Presidency, solidly voted for the amendment of the Honourable Mr. P. M. Mehta to have the measure postponed till the reports of various official and non-official bodies and persons were asked for and received, the Government majority of 11 carried the day. When the division took place, and the result was declared, five of the non-official, but elected members, in conformity with the previous announcement they had respectively made in their speeches, retired from the Council Hall. It was a silent but most significant demonstration, perfectly justifiable under the circumstances. Of what use are the "expanded" Legislative Councils where, in the face of the "genuine" and "living" representation of the people, such as Mr. Gladstone earnestly desired, the Government, secure in its majority, ignores it and carries by mere "force majeure" its own measure? Why is this solemn mockery perpetrated? Far better to abolish sham organisations which deceive the British public. So-called deliberative assemblies for the free expression of matured and enlightened public opinion, under the rule of unmitigated despotism, are an illusion. And the sooner the public in England is disillusionised about these mock Councils the better. Let the Government carry out its legislation, be it benevolent or the opposite, at its own sweet will. It would not in that case be exposed to the present charge of practising what may be called refined dissimulation. It was to let the civilised world understand what in reality are our Legislative Councils that the five representatives left the Council as soon as the motion to postpone the second reading was negatived. They disassociated themselves from the subsequent proceedings. This action has been perversely, if not maliciously, misrepresented by the apologists of the Government in the Press. The representatives have been ridiculed and railed at, as if that ridicule and raillery could in any way mitigate the inexcusable conduct of the Bombay Government. Critics observe that the incident was purely theatrical. As a matter of fact, all who were present at the proceedings deny that there was anything dramatic about it. The elected members silently and with great dignity, arising from their own self-respect and a consciousness of the duty they owed to their respective constituencies, rose and left the Council Hall. It is an open secret that official persuasion in private was brought to prevail on them to refrain from carrying out their determination. But an overpowering sense of duty constrained them to decline the request. Every independent and unbiassed person must approve of this step taken after the most mature deliberation. Never in the whole history of Indian Legislative Councils in all parts of the country has such an incident been known to have taken place. The popular representatives were fully alive to the fact. The British public will, therefore, perceive how overpowering was the cause which, in face of all persuasion, compelled them to carry out their resolve. It reflects the highest credit on their courage and independence. Whether it has added to the reputation of the Bombay Government or for that matter of British Indian government, let impartial critics decide.

In this connexion it is a matter of extreme regret to have to notice the conduct of Lord Northcote. People in the Presidency have always given him credit for sympathy with popular opinion. Moreover, since his arrival in the country he has testified to that sympathy not only by words but by deeds. His deep sympathy with the famine-stricken was such that he twice gave away something like 10,000 rupees and more. In other benevolent objects, for the amelioration of the poor and the distressed, he has given large sums. He has distributed in gifts about 75 thousand rupees in about 18 months—a princely and unprecedented donation for a Governor. And on all important public occasions he had hitherto endeavoured to conciliate popular sentiments and feelings. Yet, to our intense grief, on this most grave occasion, when the beneficent policy with regard to land tenure in India deliberately laid down by liberal-minded and far-sighted statesmen of the type of Elphinstone, Munro, and Wingate, was to be revolutionised literally by "one stroke of the pen," and when 600 memorials and petitions, including two from the most influential representative bodies in Bombay and Poona, had lain on the Council table, pointing out the serious mischief of the measure if allowed to pass into law, his Excellency succumbed to the importunities of an impetuous colleague. This is indeed deplorable. The misfortune of India in matters of legislation closely affecting the social and domestic economy of the people is this, that its authors are mostly aliens who arrogate to themselves a knowledge and experience which they do not possess. After a while they retire on their pensions, while the evils, sometimes of a far-reaching character, have to be endured by the people who are helpless and powerless. The legislators are far away and out of the reach of the cries of those who are suffering woe and misery. The Bill which has just been arbitrarily passed, in defiance of public opinion, has been of this mischievous character. Neither Lord Northcote nor Mr. Monteath will be in India three years hence to witness the consequences of their legislation. Such is the situation, and such the hapless lot of Indians.

It may be worthy of notice that no official member, neither Mr. Monteath nor any one of those who supported him, had a single word to reply to the open challenge made in the Council by the Honourable Mr. Mehta. A cloud of irrelevancies was brought in by each of these official ventriloquists to obscure the one and sole issue. The issue was of course whether or not by the amending Act the Government contemplated, under cover of the forfeiture of land, to revolutionise the whole tenure of survey-land. Mr. Mehta asked, even admitting for argument's sake that alienation of land demands restriction owing to the alleged facility of the rayats in borrowing—though this is unproven—what reply had the Government to make regarding the extinction of the perpetuity tenure, as prescribed in sections 68 and 73. Where was the justification of it? Not one member on the official side was able to say a word. Their legal adviser, the Advocate-General, was mute.

Yet in face of this situation the honourable mover of the Bill had the audacity to characterise the popular agitation as that of money-lenders. A greater libel was never uttered by a responsible member of Government. He adduced absolutely no proof in support of his reckless statement, and yet that statement was echoed in Parliament

by the autocrat of the India Office, while making his jubilant speech over a fortuitous surplus.

The reply, which occupied one full hour in delivery, given by the Honourable Mr. Mehta, traversed every argument urged by the official speakers. Its effect on the whole Council, as related by eye-witnesses, was indeed great. After such a speech, had it been delivered in the House of Commons, the fate of the measure would without doubt have been sealed. But such is the constitution of the so-called "expanded" councils that all logic, all reasoning, all stubborn facts, were lost on the Government who, with its majority, carried the Bill. It is to be hoped the many misrepresentations which have been sedulously circulated here will be exposed in England, so that the British public may not be deceived. Not a stone has been left unturned here to discredit the agitation and belittle the popular representatives in the Council. But truth will out.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, September 12.—To-day's bulletins as to the condition and progress of President McKinley were not less satisfactory than those of preceding days. A test made last night was said to show that his blood was perfectly free from any indication of poisoning, peritonitis, or inflammation. This morning he was able for the first time to take solid nourishment, and relished it.

Lord Kitchener, in a telegram of last evening, reported Colonel Crabbe's success in dispersing Van der Merwe's commando and killing its leader. He also announced that C. Kruger, son of the ex-President, surrendered on Wednesday. A Mafeking telegram gave details of the victory gained by Lord Methuen over three combined commandos under Delarey in the vicinity of Zeerust. The Boers were known to have lost 20 killed, including General Lemmer and a Field Cornet, and 17 wounded, while 44 of them were taken prisoners. Our troops also captured 300 vehicles, 15,000 cattle, 40,000 sheep, and a few horses. The British losses were 15 killed and 30 wounded. There were numerous surrenders in the Mafeking district during the past few days. Captures of prisoners, wagons, and stock were reported from the Orange River Colony. Trials for treason and kindred offences were proceeding at Pretoria, Kimberley, and other places. Lord Milner arrived at Johannesburg on Tuesday evening. The Cape Parliament was further prorogued to November 20. The Boer delegates in Europe lodged with The Hague Arbitration Court an appeal for arbitration and a complaint of the British methods of carrying on the war.

FRIDAY, September 13.—A startling change for the worse took place during Thursday night in the condition of President McKinley. It had become impracticable to continue the system of supplying nourishment by injection, and the method of giving it in the ordinary way was resorted to as a matter of necessity and as the only alternative to starvation. But the patient's digestive organs were unable to assimilate the food, and his weakness became alarming, failure of the heart's action being especially observable. Methods of stimulation were resorted to, and after some hours there was a slight improvement, so that, although the President's condition was admitted to be very critical, a bulletin issued this afternoon was distinctly hopeful in tone. But the extreme weakness arising from the difficulty of taking nourishment continued to be the dominant feature in the patient's condition, and the latest reports indicated that he was steadily sinking, and that death might occur at almost any moment.

From Pretoria it was reported that the system of night marches which was being carried out vigorously in the Eastern Transvaal was meeting with considerable success. In the Orange River Colony, the South African Constabulary had cleared the country between Bloemfontein and Jacobsdal, and in two successful fights within the last few days had inflicted heavy loss on the enemy. An intercepted despatch from Commandant Liebenberg to Delarey contained some extraordinary fictions about British disasters in Natal and near Pretoria, and stated that England and France had come to blows, that the latter was blockading the Channel, that Russia was bombarding all the Cape harbours, and that the Powers had intervened to stop the war.

SATURDAY, September 14.—President McKinley, after some hours of unconsciousness, died at 2.15 a.m. Some time previously he had taken a tender farewell of his wife. His last words were:—"Good-bye, all, good-bye! It is God's way. His will be done." A "post mortem" examination was made, and the physicians reported that the cause of death was gangrene, which occurred in both the wounds in the stomach and in the after-track of the bullet. There was no sign of peritonitis or of disease of other organs, and no indication of any attempt at repair on the part of nature. Death was unavoidable by any surgical or medical treatment, and was the direct result of the bullet wound. A short religious service was held over the body in Dr. Milburn's house, where death took place. The body was then removed to the Buffalo City Hall, where there was a lying in state, and was to be conveyed on Monday to Washington, and on Thursday to Canton, Ohio, for interment. Mr. Roosevelt, the Vice-President, who succeeded under the Constitution to the office of President, had gone to the Adirondacks on a shooting excursion, under the impression that Mr. McKinley's recovery was certain. He was summoned by telegraph yesterday, but was unable to reach Buffalo until to-day noon. He was sworn in as President in presence of several members of the Cabinet, who, at his request, consented to continue in their offices for the present, and he intimated that no change would be made in the general policy of the Administration. President Roosevelt subsequently issued a proclamation, countersigned by Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, referring to the death of Mr. McKinley as a great calamity to the people of the United States, and appointing Thursday next, the day of the funeral, as a day of mourning and prayer throughout the Union. The news of Mr. McKinley's death, especially as following so closely on the reports of his probable recovery, was received not only in the United States, but all over the world, with feelings of profound sorrow and sympathy, which found expression in innumerable messages from Sovereigns, Governments, individual statesmen, public bodies, and private persons, addressed both to the American Government, through its representatives abroad, and to the late President's widow. Among those who sent such messages were King Edward, the German Emperor, and most of the other European Sovereigns. The King commanded that the Court should wear mourning for a week.

Telegrams from Middelburg and Matjesfontein, Cape Colony, reported successful fights with Theron on September 11 and 12. On Friday he attacked Heidelberg with about 80 men, but was repulsed with loss. It was announced in more than one quarter that Lord Kitchener's proclamation was having effect, and that the number of surrenders had largely increased during the past few days. The trial of Mr. Broeksma, a Hollander, formerly Public Prosecutor at Johannesburg, on charges of breaking the oath of neutrality and treason, was begun at Johannesburg on Thursday. It excited great interest. The evidence consisted entirely of documents found in the prisoner's house, including correspondence with Dr. Krause, now under remand in London.

MONDAY, September 16.—The lying in state of the body of the murdered President in the Buffalo City Hall yesterday was a very imposing spectacle. More than 100,000 persons passed the catafalque. Early this morning the coffin was removed to the railway station and placed in a car attached to a special train which started for Washington, where it was to arrive about 9 o'clock in the evening. Mrs. McKinley travelled in the funeral train, and by her express desire the body was to be taken from the Capitol at Washington for transportation to Canton, Ohio, to-morrow. The manifestations of the public sorrow in New York were remarkable. Most of the buildings were draped in black. Messages and letters of sympathy continued to be received in large numbers by the American Embassy in London and by the Embassies and Ministries of the United States in other countries. It was announced that there would be memorial services in St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey on the day of the funeral, and the London Stock Exchange and all American business offices in the metropolis would be closed.

Some desultory fighting was reported from Cape Colony. Sentences passed on rebels at Somerset East and Cradock were reduced. A Reuter telegram from Brussels said that Mr. Kruger was much depressed by the news of his son's surrender, but he was still undaunted, and more bitter. Notwithstanding the disasters to Lotter's and Van der Merwe's commandos, Afrikanders in Brussels and at The Hague considered the situation in Cape Colony to be still very hopeful.

TUESDAY, September 17.—On the arrival at Washington of the funeral train from Buffalo last night, the coffin containing the remains of the late President was taken to the White House, where it remained during the night. This morning it was borne in a solemn procession—including President Roosevelt, the members of the Cabinet, members of the Diplomatic Body, and other prominent personages—to the Capitol, where a memorial service was held in the Rotunda. In the evening the coffin was taken to the railway station, and a special train started with it for Canton, Ohio, where the funeral ceremony takes place on Thursday.

Lord Kitchener, in a telegram dated yesterday, said that the columns reported as the result of last week's work, 47 Boers killed, seven wounded, 371 taken prisoners, and 134 surrenders, with the capture of 236 rifles, 22,750 rounds of

small-arm ammunition, 164 wagons, 3,400 horses, 5,750 cattle, and other stock. An attack was made by the enemy on Belfast on Sunday night, but was easily repulsed. General Blood's columns were working towards Ermelo.

The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall, when they landed at Quebec yesterday afternoon, had an enthusiastic welcome. Replying to an address presented by the Mayor, the Duke referred in warm terms to the services rendered by the Canadian troops in South Africa, and also alluded to the bereavement just sustained by the people of the United States. In the afternoon the Duke visited Laval University, where he received the honorary degree of LL.D.

WEDNESDAY, September 18.—Lord Kitchener reported a slight reverse in Cape Colony. A patrol of the Grenadier Guards was surrounded on a farm near Reit siding, on the De Aar-Naauwpoort line, and after a stubborn resistance was captured. The officer in command and one man were killed, two men were dangerously wounded, and a sergeant was drowned while crossing a river to go for assistance.

The removal of the remains of President McKinley from Washington to Canton gave rise to another demonstration of the popular grief in America at his untimely end.

The Tsar and Tsaritsa arrived at Dunkirk on board the "Standart," and were received by President Loubet. In proposing the health of the Imperial guests at a luncheon subsequently the President said the ringing cheers of the French sailors were similar to those which in every part of France would salute the beloved Sovereigns of the great nation which with common sympathies and coincident interests, daily united its policy more closely to theirs. The Tsar, in reply, said he experienced especial pleasure in returning to France and to the midst of a friendly and allied nation.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

"LAND ASSESSMENTS AND MIDDLEMEN."

Sir,—Some one has kindly sent me a copy of your issue of the 2nd of August, containing a letter on Mr. Thorburn's paper, to which my attention is specially directed; and, with your permission, I should like to thank my unknown friend and also to make a few remarks on the letter signed "Senex."

2. There is no doubt a good deal of confusion as to the character of a rayat's "property" in land; but to say, as "Senex" appears to say, that there is no such thing as individual property in land is only to "make confusion worse confounded."

3. Every rayat has a right of occupancy as long as his assessment is paid, and that right of occupancy constitutes a "property" in the land subject to the right of Government to a share in the produce. He cannot even be ejected as long as he pays the Government demand, and must be compensated for his interest (or "property") in the land if it is taken up for public purposes. It seems to me mere quibbling to say that such a right of permanent occupancy does not constitute a form of "property" in the land, however far it may be from being "freehold." As Sir Thomas Munro used to say, "the rayat" (in Madras at any rate), "is the true proprietor; for whatever does not belong to the sowcar belongs to him." If it was so even in the days of Munro it is much more so now, when he has dealt with his land as "proprietor" uninterruptedly for nearly a century.

4. The fact that the conception of individual property in land hardly existed in pre-British days does not really affect the question; because the old village communities had precisely the same occupancy right which has now, under our individualistic regime, devolved upon the individual rayat. The character of the tenure has not altered at all: it is still the Hindu sharing system. The actual cultivator, whether "communal" or "individual," and the Government are really joint owners of every bit of land; and, as long as the rayat can pay the Government its share of the produce in due time, he has an absolutely indefeasible right to hold his land FOR EVER, or be compensated for disturbance. As the Madras Government observed in a remarkable paper many years after Sir Thomas Munro's time (1857): "The proprietary right of a rayat is PERFECT, and as long as he pays the fixed assessment on his land he can be ousted by no one. . . . . The Government deny that any right can be more strong."

5. How that right can be equitably curtailed and reduced by refusing him the right to mortgage as well as sell it I cannot understand; and I am not sure that I even apprehend the argument to the contrary in para. 3 of this letter at all. Sir James Lyall was clearly right in saying that this "property" of the rayat had become "valuable" as "security" only owing to the moderation of the Government demand; and of course it would be quite possible for the Government to destroy its value altogether and regain sole possession (just as it has EXCLUSIVE possession of all waste land) by excessive taxation, in the same way as the "single taxers" in this country propose to destroy the property of our landlords without compensation.

6. "Senex" says that "security" is not "property" that can be transferred as "may a coat or a pony"; but it certainly is; and what "Senex" describes as "The beneficiary interest in the soil, that immemorial perdurable consuetudinary right of the rayat as such, the one clear, firm inalienable (?) economic basis of the Indian agricultural compact" is, in simpler language, the rayat's "property," or customary interest in the soil, and nothing else.—Yours, etc.,

September 16, 1901. J. B. PENNINGTON.

GLASGOW INTERNATIONAL ASSEMBLY.

LECTURES ON INDIA.

III.—PROFESSOR MURISON ON EDUCATION, THE PRESS, SELF-GOVERNMENT, AND GENERAL PROGRESS.

[SPECIAL REPORT.*]

Professor MURISON (continuing) said:

Well, you can judge what that means when I tell you that at any rate in the twelve years from 1885 to 1897, in Bengal, only six Indians educated in Great Britain were admitted to the higher branch, and not one of them was appointed from Whitehall. They had to go out to India and wait, while British graduates, not always with better degrees, were sent out to fill vacancies. Details were stated by Mr. Prithwis Chandra Ray, assistant-secretary to the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, in the "Manchester Guardian" for September 13, 1900. I will only mention that one of the Bengal six was the eminent Professor Bose, of the Presidency College, Calcutta, whose physical researches have struck even Lord Kelvin "with wonder and admiration."

Now, see how this reorganisation works out in practice. In the Indian Education Service, practically closed to Natives, an official begins at Rs.500 a month, rising Rs.50, so that after four years he has Rs.700, and after ten years Rs.1,000, while principalships of Colleges are worth more. In the Provincial Educational Service, to which Natives are practically restricted, the pay begins at Rs.200 (and in some parts at Rs.150), and never rises beyond Rs.700, which is reached in the higher branch after four years' service. Mr. A. M. Bose, speaking to a Resolution on the subject at the Twelfth Indian National Congress, at Calcutta, in 1897, said:—

> A Native of India, however high his education may have been in the Universities of Europe, however exalted the position he may have taken in the highest competitions in England, can at the end of his life in the Provincial service expect to rise only to Rs.700, possibly after 25 or more years of service—service reckoned not only by length of years, but it may be by important researches, by unique discoveries, by valuable and noteworthy work in advancing the cause of education (Shame!)—whereas in the higher branch, which is open only to Europeans, at the end of ten years alone the salary SHALL be Rs.1,000. Or, look at the matter in another way. A European member of the Education Department will get Rs.700 a month—and he will not stop there—at the end of four years of service; while an Indian member, who may have taken the same or a higher degree, will at the end of his life draw no more than that amount of Rs.700, and will probably enjoy the further honour of being the subordinate of the former." (Shame!)

Is it surprising that Mr. Bose's speech was punctuated with cries of "Shame"?

Such, then, is forty years' outcome of the high aspirations of the Despatch of 1854. Well, let us not despise the day of small things; let us study the causes of the smallness and try to remedy them. Let us, further, remember that the impulse is greater than the immediate results. The Government dare not openly crush education; but the evil work can be done quietly under the cloak of profuse promises. Listen to the Secretary of State in his last Budget Statement:—

> "No one looking at the systems (of education) in force can deny that primary as against secondary education has been neglected, and that in the higher branches of education a purely literary degree of a perfunctory character and in many cases of no subsequent use has, until quite recent times, pushed technical and industrial education out of the field. These obvious defects must be redressed. . . . . "

Here is a confession of the failure of the policy of 1854, and the futile official promise of redress. What hope is there here when the impressive provisions of 1854 have come to so little? Well, I always remember the words of James Routledge: "We have opened to India a new door, a new life of knowledge, and the strongest arms in the world never again can close the door." Like all other futilities of Indian administration the educational weakness goes back to the question of policy. Our policy despises the Native, and wastes his money. The people cry aloud for education; the Government tells them they are no good when they are educated, puts Europeans in nearly every berth that has a decent salary attached to it, charges enormously high rates for European services, pushes on premature public works to the profit of business people with voting power in England, fights the tribesmen on the Frontier, and—points to an empty exchequer. Then we glory in our service as "trustees" for the Indian people! But for all these things there will inevitably come a day of judgment.

THE PRESS.

Closely associated with Education is the Press. The first English newspaper in India was "Hicky's Gazette," started at Calcutta on January 29, 1780. The first Native newspaper was the "Samachar Durpan," which issued from the Serampore Press on May 29, 1818. Now there are 18 dailies in India, five of which are edited by Natives; and altogether there are over 1,000 newspapers. The power of such an increasing influence must be enormous, for good or for evil.

Here, of course, the freedom of the Press is established beyond any question, and proprietor, editor, and publisher have nothing to fear except the law of libel: an occasional appearance at the Bar of the House of Commons is only a first-class advertisement which costs nothing. The same principle has generally applied in India, though now and again the Press has been muzzled on special grounds. Hicky, the first editor, wallowed in personal scurrilities, for which he endured personal flagellations and the

* Concluded from page 131.

risks of assassination. Duane, an Irish-American, the third Anglo-Indian editor, being too effervescent for the Government, was deported to England—a step that the Court of Directors "highly approved." In 1799, the first restrictions on the Press were imposed by Lord Wellesley, for fear of journalistic indiscretions at a time of keen French rivalry: no paper was to be published until previously inspected by the proper Government official, on penalty of instant deportation to Europe. The position of the Press under Lord Minto (1806-13) is described by Sir John Kaye ("Life of Lord Metcalfe," i, 136):—

> During the administration of Lord Minto this dread of the free diffusion of knowledge became a chronic disease, which was continually afflicting the members of Government with all sorts of hypochondriacal fears and nightmares, in which visions of the printing press and the Bible were ever making their flesh creep, and their hair stand erect with horror. It was our policy in those days to keep the Natives of India in the profoundest possible state of barbarism and darkness, and every attempt to diffuse the light of knowledge among the people, either of our own or the independent States, was vehemently opposed and resented. Whilst the Press was regarded almost in the light of an infernal machine, of course the censorship was continued.

Sir John tells an illustrative story of Captain Sydenham, our Resident at Haiderabad, who had procured for the Nizam an air-pump, a printing press, and the model of a man-of-war, as samples of the appliances of European science. He was censured on account of the printing press. Having explained how little interest the Nizam had taken in the thing, "he added that if the Government still felt any uneasiness about the presence of this dangerous instrument of civilisation at the Court of the Nizam, he could easily obtain admission to the Tosha-Khana (or Treasure-house), and there so cripple the press as to ensure its never being in a fit state to do duty again!" Lord Hastings (1813-23) relaxed the Press restrictions gradually, declaring publicly that it was advantageous to Government that its acts should be subjected to public discussion. His temporary successor, Mr. Adam, a good kind-hearted man, but swathed in official routine, made a great noise by the deportation of Mr. Silk Buckingham. Lord Amherst again made gradual relaxations, and Lord William Bentinck, who was more violently assailed than any other Governor-General, generously admitted "that he derived more information from the Indian Press of the real state of the country than from all the councils, all the boards, and all the secretaries by whom he was surrounded." Still even he thought it advisable on one special occasion to muzzle the Press. Sir Charles Metcalfe, then a member of the Supreme Council, protested strongly, and in 1835, on becoming Acting-Governor-General when Lord William retired, he completely emancipated the Press, not without serious risks to his own prospects. The Press remained free and prosperous till Canning's temporary "Gagging Act," passed in the first heat of the Mutiny, and repealed when the country settled down again. Then for the first time the Press restrictions were directed specially against the Native journals; hitherto they had been mainly designed against Anglo-Indian criticism. Lord Lytton's Vernacular Press Act of 1878 forged fresh fetters, which were struck off by Lord Ripon in 1882. And now, once more, the Indian Press lies bound and gagged by the recent Sedition Acts—properly amendments of the Penal Code and of the Criminal Procedure Code.

A word about these Sedition Acts. They were the outcome of panic, not of sound knowledge and deliberate judgment. You will remember the dastardly assassination of Mr. Rand (the Collector of Poona and Chairman of the Poona Plague Committee), and Lieutenant Ayerst, on June 22, 1897. The more ignorant Press of London instantly clamoured for restrictions upon the Indian Vernacular Press, and Lord George Hamilton on July 1 said in the House of Commons:—

> "The habitual dissemination of false intelligence and of appeals to religious animosities by a portion of the Vernacular Press is a matter which has for some years past received the careful attention of the Indian Government; and if the result of the present enquiry [into the causes and circumstances of the assassinations] is to show that this outrage was prompted by articles of this character, the question of taking measures to prevent the encouragement of crime through the Press will undoubtedly be taken into consideration."

The Native journals unanimously and strenuously condemned the revolting murders; but it was easy to call this policy. The police could not find the miscreants; Anglo-Indian exclamations became loud and deep; the Government must "do something." So they suddenly arrested and deported the brothers Natu under a forgotten Regulation of 1827, and did not then or subsequently specify any charge whatever; and they prosecuted Mr. Tilak, a member of the Bombay Legislative Council and an accomplished scholar, for something that appeared in a paper of his published at Poona. Neither the judge, nor the counsel, nor two-thirds of the jury in the Tilak case could read the incriminated sentences in the original Marathi, and the jurymen that could read them were in favour of acquittal. But the Hon. Mr. Tilak was sent to prison. Now the section of the Penal Code under which he was prosecuted was explained by Sir Fitzjames Stephen, who was the author of it, in these simple terms: "You may say what you like about any Government measure, you may publish or speak what you please, so long as you say or write what is consistent with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government." That is plain and reasonable. But even the London "Standard" could not stomach the judge's summing up. "Might it not be contended," it justly asked, "that hatred and detestation of the Government [I should rather say "of acts or omissions of the Government or of Government officials"] are sometimes compatible, or in practice may be co-existent, with a disposition to obey the commands of a stronger power? We have it on the authority of a late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal that, in the opinion of the ablest lawyers in India, forcible resistance to Government must be distinctly advocated to bring a newspaper within the scope of the law. Unquestionably, Mr. Justice Strachey has given greater elasticity to the wording of the Code." Yes; but this Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal was not in a panic; Mr. Justice Strachey was not one of the ablest lawyers in India; and the Government, which had now got "something done," promoted Mr. Justice Strachey to be Chief Justice of Allahabad. No unbiassed man is capable of believing that Mr. Tilak, in the teeth of all his material interests, had any seditious intention whatever.

But what of the murders? Why, a man, Damodar Chapecar, confessed them and was hanged. Lord George Hamilton had talked of a widespread conspiracy in the Deccan, which the Government enquiries were to unveil; but the judge that tried Chapecar declared that he had watched vigilantly for evidence of a conspiracy and had discerned not a trace. No such conspiracy ever was unveiled; and no connexion was ever established between the murders and the vernacular newspapers. The existing Code had sufficed for the Tilak case. And yet the Government persisted in enacting fresh restrictions of a most stringent nature, which are still in force. But why should I say "the Government"? In fact, the Government of India (Oct. 14, 1897) expressly informed the Secretary of State that "we consider that it is not necessary or desirable to amend the Section" (Sect. 124A of the Penal Code). The responsibility lies with the Secretary of State in Council, who over-ruled the Government of India, and actually sent them a draft clause, whose terms they somewhat mitigated during its passage through the Viceroy's Council. The Section now reads:

> "Whoever by words, either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representation or otherwise, brings or attempts to bring into hatred or contempt, or excites or attempts to excite, disaffection towards her Majesty or the Government as established by law in British India, shall be punished with transportation for life or any shorter term, to which fine may be added, or with imprisonment which may extend to three years, to which fine may be added, or with fine.
>
> "Explanation I.—The expression 'Disaffection' includes disloyalty and all feelings of enmity."

It is only too easy to see how such an elastic law may become oppressive, especially in times of excitement, with a weak judge and an Anglo-Indian jury. We have been told that it represents substantially the law of England. Yes, if you go back a century to the language of Lord Kenyon. But nowadays, in England, and even in Ireland, the gist of the offence of sedition is incitement to public disorder, or to forcible resistance of the lawful authority of Government. Besides, the effect of the law must be judged, not merely from the words, but from the circumstances of its administration, which are very much more oppressive to the accused in India than at home. In terms, indeed, the law applies to Anglo-Indian as well as to the Native journals, but in fact there is not the slightest chance of its being applied to journals that are not Native. I should add that in the Bombay Presidency idiotic Press Committees were established, ostensibly to keep officials informed of the contents of the local journals and to give true information to editors, but practically to overawe the editors. Yet Lord George Hamilton says there is "no censorship of the Press."

Well, for example:—On May 26, 1898, the "Gulburga Samachar," a small paper in Haidarabad, published an article on the frequent outrages committed by Europeans on Indians, and the inadequate punishments sometimes inflicted. At the instance of our officiating Resident, it was suppressed for six months. (INDIA, Jan. 20, 1899.)

In 1898, the Editor of an obscure paper, the "Kala" (or "Times"), was required to express regret for having written that "it was bad that the Natives should not possess strength or endurance enough to bear a few strokes or kicks given by Europeans." Yet such outrages on Natives were then shockingly common. (INDIA, Aug. 5, 1898.)

In October, 1900, the Editor of the "Kalidas," a vernacular journal published at Benares (circulation 350), was sent to prison for one year. What was his crime? He had stated that whites are treated better than blacks, and that Christians in India forget Christianity. Would it not have been more useful to mark the truth in the allegation, and urge a reformation? Anyhow, imagine (if you can) such proceedings in Glasgow!

The whole system is not only morally discreditable but politically most dangerous. I agree entirely with what Mr. Romesh Dutt wrote (INDIA, Feb. 25, 1898): "The Native Indian Press criticises the action of Anglo-Indian officials: partisanship puts this down as 'disaffection' to British rule. The Native Indian Press claims for the people a share in the real administration of the country: partisanship puts this down as 'disloyalty' to the present form of Government." I agree entirely also with what Mr. Dutt said in his Presidential Address to the Indian National Congress (Dec. 27, 1899): "If I were disposed to foment sedition in India, I would desire in the first place to suppress all free discussion, suppress all newspapers, and suppress all public meetings, as a burglar puts out the lights of a room before he commits burglary." There is no such thing as disloyalty or disaffection or sedition in India; and anything that looks like it is the unhappy product of official repression. For our own sakes, for the advantage of knowing what the population is thinking, the Press ought to be set absolutely free. For such advantage there is hardly any price that is too high.

I will add two English testimonies that ought to carry weight. Sir John Kaye, writing in 1854, said ("Metcalfe, i, 154-6):

"What was called the 'licentiousness' of the Indian Press

was, perhaps, the characteristic which of all others, in a Government point of view, constituted its chief utility. The Indian Press was said to be a 'licentious' Press because it sometimes attacked the measures of Government as a body, and sometimes the acts or characters of individual servants of the Government. In the former case, it was a great safety-valve. Discontent exhausted itself in big words; and the flower, safety, was plucked from the nettle, danger. In the other case, it had all the advantages of a vast system of espionage, without any of the odium that attached to the direct employment of spies. . . . . Thus a free Press in India was calculated to strengthen the hands of Government, by giving them a power of supervision and control over their servants which nothing else could supply. And that it has abundantly performed this important function—that it has exposed much evil, that it has led the way to much good, and altogether contributed largely to the successful administration of the last twenty years—is a fact which nothing but the most inveterate prejudice would urge a man to deny. The Government has never been so strong; the servants of Government have never been so efficient; the relations between all estates and all classes have never been so harmonious; there has never been more order and tranquillity in the country, more peace and goodwill among men, than during the years which have elapsed since Charles Metcalfe liberated the Indian Press."

Now step from 1854 to 1895—fully forty years—and compare the experienced judgment of Sir Richard Garth, ex-Chief Justice of Bengal:

> "I read Native papers myself, week after week, and never see anything there at all approaching sedition, or disloyalty or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well-deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials. I am afraid this is exactly what the Government would wish to repress."

Sir Richard, I apprehend, has hit the nail on the head. But, granting that Native journals have many and serious shortcomings, and that small papers here and there occasionally mistake license for liberty, it seems an unfortunate policy for a strong Government to betray weakness by taking serious notice of them; and, in any case, as Charles James Fox said with a wider reference, "the remedy for the abuse of liberty is more liberty still."

Local Self-Government.

My next subject is Local Self-Government. We are all familiar with peremptory scoffs at the very idea that the Indians should be regarded as capable of self-government. We know what such scoffs mean: they mean ignorance, or prejudice, or the temper of domination. Local self-government was practised throughout India long centuries before Britain was known to history. The village communities of India form an interesting subject of early social and political study. They suffered rather severely under the rule of the Mughals, but the town panchayats (councils of five elders) were plentiful for years after the Mutiny, and I daresay they are even yet to be found in remote corners, though society has generally outgrown their capacities. But they have left the genius of self-government in the very blood of the people.

The existing municipal institutions, however, are not expanded and revivified village communities; they are fresh creations of the Government. There are now 760 municipalities, with a population of 15,849,670, and an income (apart from loans, sales of securities and such extraordinary receipts) of £2,975,000; or, including loans, etc., close on 5¼ millions. There are some 200 District Boards, later creations of Government, with many subdivisional or minor boards or committees in most Provinces, to which much of the detailed work is delegated. Except in Madras, and to some degree in Bengal, they possess no powers of taxation; they simply "administer funds, or the yield of specific imposts, made over to them for expenditure on roads, schools, hospitals, and sanitation, within their jurisdiction." These funds now amount to £2,088,700. There are also bodies of port trustees, "having charge of harbour works, port approaches, and pilotage," with funds that now amount to £1,111,300. There are, besides, numerous bodies discharging similar duties in towns other than constituted municipalities, and in cantonments. The total funds administered by all the local bodies amount to £6,532,300. The total local indebtedness was (March 31, 1900) £7,124,361.

The presidency towns—Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay—have always been under regulations of their own; and up to the middle of last century, so far as the Government had trenched on the panchayats, local affairs were administered by local committees nominated by Government, and entirely in the hands of Government officials. It was naturally in the three Presidency towns that modern municipalities were first established. Till 1861, though remodelled, they remained all on the same pattern; but when local legislative independence was then restored, the systems began to diverge according to the differing circumstances of each town. Bombay was the first to obtain elective government, and Calcutta demanded it in 1863. Outside the three Presidency towns, municipalities may be said to date from 1850. There was a permissive Act for Bengal in 1842, but it proved wholly ineffectual. There has been much legislation since 1850, but the development of it need not be traced now; I need only say that a great impulse was given by Lord Mayo, and a greater still by Lord Ripon. The first objects of the municipalities were water and drainage. The Act of 1850 specified "making, repairing, cleaning, lighting, or watching roads, drains, or tanks; the prevention of nuisances; or improving the town in any other manner." "Improving the town" has gradually acquired a comprehensive meaning, very much as here.

> "In most places the majority of the commissioners or committees are elected by the townsfolk under legal rules, but in every town some, and in a few minor towns all, the members are appointed by the Government. In almost every municipal body one or more Government officials sit as members; the number of Indian and non-official members, however, everywhere exceeds the number of Europeans and officials. The municipal bodies are subject to the control of the Government in so far that no new tax can be imposed, no loan can be raised, no work costing more than a prescribed sum can be undertaken, and no serious departure from the sanctioned budget for the year can be made, without the previous sanction of the Government; and no rules or bye-laws can be enforced without similar sanction and full publication."

Such is the latest official account ("Moral and Material," 1901, pp. 5-6). Apart from the general Government control, it would be readily recognised that a single official in the chair would almost certainly be able to overbear the whole majority of Native members, who would yet have to stand the racket if anything went wrong.

The sources of municipal revenue are, mainly: "house-tax, tax on rent, octroi duties, bazaar or market rents, carriage tax, water-rates, conservancy rates, rents of public lands and properties, and public gardens and parks" (Ibid., p. 6). It may be interesting to note that the rates in Calcutta amount to 9s. a head; in the interior of Bengal generally, an average of 1s. 5½d.; in the North-West Provinces and Oudh, about 1s. 7d.; in Madras city, 3s., and in the interior, 1s. 4d.; in Bombay city, not stated; and in Bombay interior, from 1s. 4d. in the Southern division to 4s. in Sind.

Now how has this municipal government succeeded? Let us dip into the official reports here and there. The official report ("Moral and Material") 1870-71, says: "The Lieutenant-Governor (of the North-West Provinces) looks most hopefully upon the results of the municipal system. Having met in his circuit nearly all the municipal bodies in the Province, he is of opinion that a sense of independence and self-government has been very generally aroused among them, and that for the education of the Native mind and the development of political virtues no agency has proved so powerful or given promise of such good results."

Next year (1871-72) the official report, after details, says: "The general habit of self-government is thus being gradually diffused throughout India. In some parts, its development is more rapid and complete than in others; but everywhere it is beginning to have an effect upon the people."

Ten years later, the official report (1882-83) says: The municipalities "have already become both a stimulus for promoting, and a means of satisfying, the popular desire for self-government."

In 1889, an official Memorandum giving a general survey of the thirty years after the Mutiny, says: "A valuable beginning has been made in local self-help and self-government, and much local interest has been evoked in local affairs. . . . . A seat on a municipal board is generally recognised by the people as an honourable and useful post, though it carries no emoluments and much responsibility." The same Memorandum tells us that "the Government and its officers habitually afford help, advice, control, and even admonition, to any municipal bodies that may seek or require such aid." Clearly, then, the municipalities, if constantly assisted by Government, are also constantly hampered; but the responsibility, it will be observed, is not divided.

The latest official report (1899-1900) says: "The objects on which municipal funds can be spent are, mainly, water-supply, hospitals and dispensaries, streets and roads, vaccination, drainage, sanitation, and education. Municipalities do more for the benefit of their citizens under these heads than was done before by Government officers; and the commissioners or committees generally evince diligence and public spirit in the performance of their honorary duties. The interest in the municipal elections, and in municipal affairs generally, is not keen, save in a few cities and large towns; but, as education and knowledge advance, interest in the management of local affairs gradually increases. It is reported from most Provinces that municipal work is fairly well done, and municipal responsibilities are, on the whole, faithfully discharged, though occasional shortcomings and failures occur in particular towns. The tendency of these local bodies is to be slow in imposing additional taxes, in adopting sanitary reforms, and in incurring new expenditure. Many members of municipal bodies are diligent in their attendance to work, whether at meetings for business or on benches for decision of petty criminal cases."

I venture to think, on the official admissions, that the progress of self-government has been exceedingly good in the circumstances. I should not wish to mitigate severe animadversion on local bodies that neglect their duties; but we must not forget the commanding influence of Government officials in the chair, and we must remember that when local bodies are blamed for slowness in imposing taxes, in reforming sanitation, and generally in incurring new expenditure, the Native members probably have a keener sense of the poverty of the ratepayers than their European colleagues and critics. This curse of poverty is the ever present obstacle everywhere—except in warlike enterprises.

Thirty years ago the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, you will remember, stated that "for the education of the Native mind and the development of political virtues no agency has proved so powerful or given promise of such good results." Well, does the Government encourage this indefinitely useful agency? Let me illustrate the recent spirit of the Government from the case of Calcutta. Calcutta is about as big as Glasgow. It has a population of 860,000. Let us glance at its history. What was its condition in 1863? Sir John Strachey, speaking of the northern or Native division, said: "No language can adequately describe its abominations. In the filthiest quarters of the filthiest towns that I have seen in other parts of India or in other countries, I have never seen anything which can be for a moment compared with the filthiness of Calcutta." In

1876, a new Act placed the town under the administration of commissioners, two-thirds of whom were elected by the taxpayers. What was the result? A resolution of the Bengal Government in 1890 described the work of the Municipal Commissioners and of their chairman, Sir Henry Harrison, thus:

"For nine years he was chairman of the Corporation, and the successful administration of the affairs of the Municipality during this long period, the firm financial credit of the Commissioners, the innumerable sanitary reforms effected, ... the increase in material prosperity in the city, which, in consequence of these reforms, has shown itself in so marked a degree that the value of land in Calcutta generally may be said to have doubled, the reorganisation and reconstruction of nearly every department of work, the hearty zeal and co-operation with which the Commissioners as a body now unite with the Executive to advance the welfare of the city, ... the methodical and systematic development of civic administration in all departments are a sufficient and lasting tribute to the manner in which Sir Henry Harrison has discharged the duties of his responsible, difficult, and thankless office."

Yes, and a tolerably high tribute to the Commissioners as well. Sir Henry's successor, Mr. Lee, said in his annual report for the next year (1891-92):

"The most damaging criticism that is commonly levelled against the principle of local self-government in Bengal is that it prevents or obstructs a reasonable outturn of work. I maintain that the record of the Calcutta Commissioners refutes this criticism."

After three years in the chair, Mr. Lee answered the gossip that alleged too much talk and too little work in these words:

"In all my experience . . . . I have seldom listened to a speech that has not been useful and to the point. I can hardly recall a single instance in which I have made the reflection that the speaker was throwing no light on his subject and was simply speaking to make a speech."

And he supported his opinion with statistics of work. Yet four years later, in the beginning of 1898—when the home Government were menacing the County Council of London—rumours got about that the Bengal Government was going to reform the Corporation of Calcutta. I cannot enter into the pros and cons here; but the whole question was discussed in a long series of articles in the journal INDIA during 1898 and 1899, and I stand by the conclusion that the grounds alleged by Government were either wholly unreal or grossly exaggerated. An enquiry was demanded. The Government would not grant an enquiry in any form. Even Sir Henry Fowler declared in the House of Commons that he did not see "any evidence to justify the statement that the system has broken down." But in the result, the Corporation was reduced from 75 to 50 Commissioners, and the elected Commissioners were reduced from 50 to 25, while the General Committee, which holds the executive power, was reduced from 18 to 12, and the elected representatives of the ratepayers on it from 12 to 4. What would you think if the Glasgow Corporation were "reformed" in this style? Now what has come of it? The Anglo-Indian journals that supported the Government are now wringing their hands in despair. Some three months ago the "Englishman" wrote: "Everyone appears to be agreed that the condition of municipal affairs could hardly be more unsatisfactory than it is"; and it declared that "faulty organisation, loose supervision, and bad administration" make "the name of the Corporation a byword for delay, incompetence, and failure." Well, if in the teeth of the facts you destroy self-government and make the Corporation a mere annexe of the Government of Bengal, at least do not blame the people of Calcutta. Meantime the Bombay Government have been busy with a similar Bill to "reform" the provincial municipalities. This distrust and repression of the people bodes no good. Of course, the people make mistakes; but how are they to learn except by experience? I quote a sentence written in 1885 by Mr. Cotton, now Chief Commissioner of Assam, and second only to Sir Antony MacDonnell among our Indian administrators:

"The people of India possess an instinctive capacity for local self-government, which centuries of misrule have not eradicated. . . . . As it is the development of local independence and self-government which more than anything else has given stability to the political institutions of England, so it is by a system of localised administration that we may hope for improvement and stability in the political institutions of India."

I should like also to cite Mr. Erskine, the experienced Commissioner of Sindh (May 18, 1882):

"I have seen so much good work done by these independent Committees (i.e., the village panchayats) that I certainly have never been able to understand the oft-repeated cry that Natives of this country have no capacity for self-government. It is only when their own panchayats are Europeanised and converted into Municipal Committees that Natives cease to take an interest in municipal matters. Nor is this to be wondered at, for the members of Municipal Committeees find themselves smothered in Acts and Rules, Budgets and Byelaws, till they cannot venture to do anything, while at the same time they have no real authority to compensate for this."

That is to say, India is over-governed, tied hand and foot in British red-tape. This tape will be snapped one of these days.

Shortsighted officials may delay and embarrass progress, and embroil the relations of rulers and ruled, but the future of self-government in India is as well assured as is the rising of the sun to-morrow morning.

General Progress.

I have now to consider the question of General Progress. What is progress? I seem to remember that Sir H. Maine somewhere said that he had never been able to obtain a definition of Progress. Each of you will have his own idea. It is at least patent that there could not be a small army of British officials operating with unlimited power in a country for many years without a vast deal of movement and change, and that in the direction of British ideals. There is a yearly record—the "Moral and Material" Blue-book. There you will find a statement for every branch of activity: what has been done in administration and legislation, local government, justice, finance, surveys and settlements, land revenue, forests, agriculture and mining, public works, post office and telegraphs, education and literature, trade and manufactures, foreign (or frontier) relations, and military operations. I will go back to the "Statement" for 1895-96, so as to keep clear of famine and pestilence. I take but one or two illustrative points at random. In 1894, 521,647 persons (2.44 per thousand of the population) died of cholera, and 4,952,328 (or 23.23 per mille) died of fever: the numbers were considerably less in 1895, though still appalling; but "many sanitary works were completed, in progress, and sanctioned during 1895." That, I suppose, is progress. The income tax yielded Rx.27,129 more. That looks like progress. There was a heavier output of coal, petroleum, and gold. Railways were started in the time of Dalhousie; there are now more than 25,000 miles open, satisfying the demands both of strategy and of famine, as well as of social and commercial intercommunication. There are some 40,000 miles of canals in operation, irrigating an area of some 10,000,000 acres. From five to six millions were spent on civil and military works. The imports and exports of merchandise amounted to Rx. 183,579,535 (over £120,000,000). The army maintained the frontier, and some frontier territory was even incorporated in British India. Generally, the internal administration is, we are told insistently, conducted with energy and integrity by the finest body of civil servants that the world has ever seen. Such facts as these, repeated year after year, with rising figures, bear an appearance of unquestionable progress. But there are other facts that bear another appearance: the extravagant public expenditure, especially on militarism and unnecessary public works; the exclusion of Indians from almost every position of importance in the administration; the destruction of the local crafts and the monopoly of most of the industry and commerce; the grinding of the peasants by heavy revenue demands enforced at the wrong times and in an unaccustomed form; the oppression and practical injustice worked constantly and everywhere by the system of provincial civil courts; the consequent consignment of the peasants to the grip of the moneylender; and others.

Still, define progress as you may, there has been nothing less than an astonishing progress in India under British rule. But, let me ask, was anything less to be expected in a naturally rich country during a century of British administration, absolutely free and uncontrolled? Would India have done better, if British control had never existed, and if no other foreign control had taken its place? No educated Indian would answer in the affirmative. For the British brought the first essential of progress—they commanded and ensured internal Peace; they secured internal as well as external protection. The British Government is not only welcome: not an educated Indian but would regard its withdrawal as the last calamity to his country. But not an educated Indian but insists at the same time that the advantages might be vastly greater if the Government would but remove a number of totally gratuitous disadvantages. Like ourselves, while perfectly content with the general government, the Indians agitate for reforms. It would be ridiculous to call such agitation disloyalty and sedition here; it is hardly one step less ridiculous to call it disloyalty and sedition there. Remember that the last two generations have been brought up on English literature, which is full of the story of our struggles for liberty, and is instinct with the spirit of liberty; and the Indians do us the sincere tribute of the flattery of imitation. Remember that we have made them great and solemn promises—in the Act of 1833, in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, and again in 1877 and 1887; and they take us at our word. Remember, further, that in such a process of education—as always—we must expect even an undue urgency to reap the tempting fruits; and therefore let us be patient and offer guidance, rather than be hasty and box their ears. This moral development of India under Western influences—the most important movement now in progress in the whole world—a movement unparalleled in the history of humanity—is a very complex and a very difficult thing to manage. Consider justly and carefully how immense is the help that is extended to us by the leaders of the Indian National Congress, and of the Indian Social Conference, by their large vision and their marvellous self-control. Consider, on the other hand, whether our people would not do more wisely to meet the Congressmen frankly and fairly, instead of raising factitious obstacles and casting ill-deserved reflections. For, if the Congress continue to be guided with the discretion that has marked the past sixteen years, its views must inevitably, whether our authorities like it or not, rule British India.

The Indians cry for more and more education. Has our review not shown the deep justice of their claim? They cry for the fulfilment of what we saw that the Court of Directors regarded as one important object of the expansion of education—the fuller admission of Indians to a share in the real administration of the country—their own country. They protest eagerly against the recent tendency to keep them out of all higher grades of employment—for which they diligently and successfully prepare themselves: witness especially the judicial bench, where Natives have been admitted by an English Lord Chancellor to be as efficient at least as their British colleagues. Not one Native has ever passed the threshold of the Viceroy's Executive Council; not one Native in the Legislative Councils can do more than express his opinion or ask a question—he cannot bring in a Bill. Yet Native gentle-

men have distinguished themselves as Prime Ministers of Native States—Sir Salar Jung, Sir Dinkar Rao, Sir T. Madhava Rao, and many more. We have seen how Indians are hampered in the work of self-government. True, there has been progress. But has the progress at all kept pace with the development of popular opinion and individual capacity? The authorities point to growing figures and glory in the prosperity of the country. The Indians tell you that the country is, in Lord Salisbury's language, "bleeding to death." Which is right? It behoves us to know, and to know with certainty. Do you think that even Great Britain itself could long stand a drain of some £30,000,000 a year without economic return, or that it would not soon "bleed to death," in spite of—nay by the very reason of—the big figures of its exports? Do not be befooled by Lord George Hamilton's surpluses: the bases of the Budget are unsound, and a surplus is but a mark of official exaction if it is not a sign of solid prosperity. What is meant by alleging prosperity of a country where the average yearly income is somewhere between 30s. and 40s., and where, some of our eminent officials tell us, a vast population never has enough to eat? Sir William Hunter (1881) wrote: "forty millions (one in five) of the people of India habitually go through life on insufficient food.' Sir Charles Elliott, ex-Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, wrote (1888), when Chief Commissioner of Assam: "I do not hesitate to say that half the agricultural population do not know from one year's end to another what it is to have a full meal." Is this progress? God help the poor people, if it be! If the cultivators pay, as they must pay, the Government demand for land revenue, they are mostly driven to borrow the money from the sowkars or moneylenders. "This canker of agricultural indebtedness," said Lord Curzon recently, "is eating into the vitals of India"—not here or there, but everywhere; and Government has passed legislation prohibiting the cultivators in the Punjab from alienating their land, and the Bombay Government have alarmed the whole Presidency with a measure of land reform with like objects. Well, what are they to alienate? Does this state of things indicate progress? We see famines desolating the land with increasing frequency and severity. Why? The Secretary of State says we cannot control the monsoon. I say we can: we can restore the forests, which will catch the monsoon and keep it to fertilise the surrounding land. We labour heroically to mitigate famine: can't we prevent it? Do you remember what Lord George Hamilton said in the House on Jan. 26, 1897? He said this: "Famines are terrible and inevitable incidents. I think it is a mistake, and is wrong, for any member of this House to hold out the hope that any remedies which he can suggest can prevent famines from desolating India." Yet he escaped impeachment! What! Can reafforestation do nothing? The moderate assessment of land revenue, the reduction of unnecessary expenditure in various departments (especially on military matters, new railways, official salaries, the Home Charges), an equitable apportionment of expenditure on things common to Britain and India, a frank enquiry into the real circumstances of the cultivators such as Sir William Wedderburn's Famine Union proposes—would none of these things tend to enable the people to stand the onset of famine? For, remember, a famine in India is not want of food, but want of money to buy the food. There is plenty of food, and plenty of means of bringing food to the sufferers; what is wanted is the money to buy it. And the money has been thrown over the North-West Frontier to the tune of £100,000,000 in the last forty years, and has been drained to London to the tune of probably ten times as much. I say nothing of the industry and commerce of India. We have destroyed nearly all the Native industries by our railways: our people here can outsell the local craftsmen. The commerce of India, as well as the industries requiring large capital, is mostly the commerce of Europeans resident in India. To be sure, India gets indirect benefits; but it is not properly Indian commerce. On the other hand make India genuinely prosperous, and no man can calculate the enormous expansion of British trade with a population of some 300,000,000 of people with money in their hands to buy British products.

I have touched only on a few points. I fancy you will gather that the progress—so far as there is progress—is mainly external, and therefore fraught with serious chances of failure. The real progress that I should like to see is sound internal growth. In a word: check the bleeding process—the fatal drain; bridle the military spirit; keep expenditure well within revenue, and hasten to reduce the revenue so as to let the people live without recourse to the moneylender. Give ample scope in every department to the ability, energy, and integrity of the Natives; treat them honestly on a fair footing, according to our great promises. Here is policy as well as justice. Grant the uttermost allowance for the external and superficial progress that has been made, but think of the indefinite real internal progress that has not been made, and that has been delayed by ignorance, by the temper of domination, by racial prejudice, by an unreasoning prominence of the primal sense of self-preservation. Moreover, when we speak of what Britain has done for India, let us remember that India has paid for every single British service—paid too at a higher rate than any similar services have ever fetched elsewhere in the history of government. Let us cry quits as to the past. Let us frankly prepare the Indians to govern themselves—for that is what we must come to sooner or later, and we had better act with generosity and grace. Let us meet the future, hand in hand with the leaders of Indian opinion, with courage, with justice, and with noble ideals.

Only one word more. I have spoken from the Indian point of view. But the problem of India has also a British aspect; and speaking from the British point of view, I repeat every word I have said. I would insist that we have a duty to ourselves in this matter. Lord Curzon and others have told us that if we lost India the sun of the British Empire would be set. I do not believe in any such extravagance, but I take it as a large way of acknowledging the importance of a wise Government and administration in India. Are we to shut our eyes and ears and believe just what our Indian officials choose to tell us? No. We must study the emergent questions for ourselves, and make our conclusions felt in Parliament. If we are an Imperial people in any rational sense, there lies our imperative duty—and a most complex and difficult duty it is. There is indeed no greater or more urgent political question before us now—not even the deplorable South African war. There is laid on us in India the heaviest task ever laid upon a conquering race—a task that some of our shrewdest and best instructed observers contemplate with despair; but a wise and faithful performance of it, should it indeed prove effectual, will be a political and moral triumph beyond example in the recorded history of the nations.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

422,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated September 14:—

Prospects have improved by good rain, Bengal, North-West Provinces, parts Madras, and by break in Central Provinces. The Punjab has been practically rainless, and crops suffering seriously in South-West Division, though elsewhere still reported fair. More rain is needed for grain crops in Gujerat and Deccan, where only a few light showers have been received, but where cotton still promises well. August death-rates in Bombay affected districts show a rise particularly in Gujerat, but are below 3 per 1,000, except in the case of Sholapur, Dharwar, Belgaum. Rate of Sholapur 3.72. Rates of two latter much higher owing to plague. Number of famine relief recipients shows a decrease of 25,000 in Bombay, mostly among number on gratuitous relief; but gradual tightening of conditions of work relief as harvest approaches will result shortly in Bombay. Grant of gratuitous relief has been found necessary in part of Madras, Assam. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 350,000; Bombay Native States, 37,000; Baroda, 27,000; Haidarabad, 6,000; Madras, numbers not reported; Central India States, 1,000; Central Provinces, relief discontinued; Mysore, 1,000; total, 422,000.

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MEMORIAL FROM THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

The East India Association on July 29 addressed the following Memorial to the Colonial Secretary:—

"Sir,—Now that arrangements are being made for the re-establishment and re-organisation of Civil administration in the British Colonies of the Transvaal and the Orange River, the Council of the East India Association are being urged on all sides to lose no time in renewing the efforts they began some years ago to secure more equitable treatment of His Majesty's loyal Indian subjects trading in South Africa.

"The Council are well aware of the peculiar difficulties that beset the subject, and know also that the Colonial Office has frequently expressed its sympathy with the unfortunate position of Indian traders in Natal, but they venture to submit that the Home Government, having full authority in the newly annexed States, have a most favourable opportunity for establishing a fair and honourable position for Indian traders, which may be hereafter accepted by the other South African colonies. The Council believe that no such opportunity will occur again, and they are unanimously of opinion that if it be still found impossible to secure more liberal treatment of our Indian fellow-subjects, it would be only reasonable and right for the Government of India to advise them to avoid South Africa altogether, and at the same time to prohibit the emigration of indentured coolies to any part of that country; for if the Indian Government is not in a position to secure their just rights for British Indian traders abroad, it can do no less than warn them of the fact and adopt the only measure which seems likely to compel the adoption of a more reasonable policy.

"His Majesty's Government are so well acquainted with the facts of the case that the Council feel it is unnecessary to trespass on your time with any details of the grievances complained of and will only respectfully invite your attention to the enclosed copy of their Memorial to the Secretary of State for India dated December 15th, 1897, and the reply to it."

We are informed that a reply acknowledging receipt of the Memorial has been received. A copy of the Memorial was sent to Lord Milner before he left London.

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.

Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.

Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.

A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.

India and the General Election (1900).

"Melancholy Meanness."

The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.

No National Contribution?

The "Slimness" of the India Office.

"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to "INDIA" 1901.

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE NOW?

A limited number of new Subscribers can still be supplied with copies of INDIA from the beginning of the present year. SUBSCRIPTIONS (POST FREE) SIX RUPEES.

PREPAID Subscriptions for the REMAINDER OF THE YEAR should be remitted direct to the Office in London at the following rates, which include postage:—

July 1 to end of year..3 rupees 8 annas.
August 1 to end of year..3 rupees.
Sept. 1 to end of year..2 rupees 7 annas.
Oct. 1 to end of year..2 rupees.

Do you want to know by every mail what has been done in Parliament concerning India?

Do you want to see special reports of public meetings in England concerning India?

Do you want to read what the British Press is writing about India?

———*The Journal "INDIA" will tell you.*

Remittances should accompany every order.

Address:—THE MANAGER OF "INDIA,"
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS,
WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

LEGAL EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

Full particulars of the course of study and of the cost of living, etc., etc., will be forwarded on the receipt of 8 one anna stamps, by Mr. J. M. PARIKH,
1, CLOISTERS, TEMPLE, LONDON, E.C.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England:—
September 1 to End of Year (Post free), 3s. 6d.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. B[illegible], 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.